

EMERGENCE IN INTERACTIVE ART

JENNIFER SEEVINCK

University of Technology, Sydney

Submitted to the Faculty of Engineering and Information
technology in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the
degree of Doctor of Philosophy

2011

CERTIFICATE OF AUTHORSHIP/ORIGINALITY

I certify that the work in this thesis has not previously been submitted for a degree nor has it been submitted as part of requirements for a degree except as fully acknowledged within the text.

I also certify that the thesis has been written by me. Any help that I have received in my research work and the preparation of the thesis itself has been acknowledged. In addition, I certify that all information sources and literature used are indicated in the thesis.

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'Jennifer Seevinck', with a long horizontal stroke extending to the right.

Jennifer Seevinck

October 2011

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

My sincerest thanks are extended to my supervisor Prof. Ernest Edmonds for his mentoring, his inspiring synthesis of research and aesthetic and technical sensibilities and for the moral support he has provided me. Similarly the encouragement, incisive critiquing and detailed attention I received from Dr Linda Candy, particularly in editing sections of this thesis, have been invaluable. Thanks and appreciations are also extended to friends and colleagues who gave up their time to participate in the interaction studies. In particular, thanks are extended to Dr Zafer Bilda for his assistance in designing the main study and interviewing participants. Similarly great thanks are extended to Deborah Turnbull, Aram Dulyan and Matthew Connell for their curatorial and technical installation support at Beta_Space and the Sydney Powerhouse Museum; to Rodney Berry, Dr Brigid Costello, Dr Mike Leggett, Andrew Martin, for stimulating conversations; to colleagues and friends at VMASC Old Dominion University (particularly Hector Garcia and Dr Rick McKenzie) and to QUT Creative Industries for their support and the generous loan of equipment that enabled me to investigate technical solutions. Many thanks are also extended to Ralph Crispino and the I-Park artist in residency staff for their continued support of my practice. My time in East Haddam, USA inspired the artworks presented here and this Practice-based research effort. This work has also been funded by Australian Post Graduate Award and a UTS Faculty of IT and Engineering scholarship.

Lastly many thanks are due to my family and friends for their continued support and belief that I could finish this. Thank you to Lesley Burnett for providing me with somewhere to stay over the years of my visits to Sydney. Special thanks to my parents as well: Roelof, your incisive logic and clarifying insights continue to educate and guide me in work and in life. Thanks too to Yani for inspiring my love of art and educating me in its subtleties; and for your poetic interpretations of my work. The emotional and practical support you two have given me has been invaluable. And finally to my dear Joe: thank you for lighting my way and showing me which way to go in art and in life.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CERTIFICATE OF AUTHORSHIP/ORIGINALITY	i
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	ii
LIST OF FIGURES	xii
LIST OF TABLES, EQUATIONS.....	x
ABSTRACT	xi
1 INTRODUCTION.....	1
1.1 RESEARCH SCOPE.....	1
1.1.A Introduction to interactive art	2
1.1.B Introduction to emergence	3
1.2 METHODOLOGY AND METHODS.....	3
1.2.A Practice-based research (PBR)	4
1.2.B Methods and methodologies within the PBR approach	5
1.3 OUTCOMES	6
1.4 THESIS STRUCTURE	9
1.5 CONCLUSION	10
2 STATE-OF-THE-ART REVIEW	12
2.1 INTRODUCTION	12
2.2 EMERGENCE.....	12
2.2.A Discussion.....	13
2.2.B Taxonomy of emergence in interactive art.....	21
2.2.C Review	25
2.2.D Conclusion.....	34
2.3 INTERACTIVE ART	35
2.3.A The Form of interactive art	35
2.3.B Classification of interactive art	38
2.3.C Theories relating to interaction	39
2.3.D Open interaction	42
2.3.E Emergence and openness in interaction	43
2.3.F Augmented reality (AR).....	46
2.3.G Tangible computing (TC)	47
2.3.H Affordances	50
2.3.I Review of sand.....	50
2.4 CONCLUSION	51

3 METHODOLOGY.....	53
3.1 INTRODUCTION	53
3.2 PRACTICE-BASED RESEARCH (PBR).....	55
3.2.A Role of the artefact	56
3.2.B Methods for practice	58
3.2.C Methods for evaluation	61
3.3 PBR APPROACH	68
3.3.A PBR framework	68
3.3.B Step-by-step account.....	70
3.3.C Combination of methods.....	72
3.4 METHODS FOR PRACTICE	73
3.4.A Iterative application of Combined Methods	73
3.4.B Problem framing	74
3.4.C Artefact construction.....	75
3.4.D Exploratory studies	76
3.5 METHODS FOR EVALUATION AND ANALYSIS	76
3.5.A Exploratory studies	76
3.5.B Data collection	77
3.5.C Data analysis	79
3.5.D Displays	81
3.6 CONCLUSION	82
4 FOUNDATION WORK	83
4.1 INTRODUCTION	83
4.2 VIDEO ART & RESEARCH.....	83
4.3 RESPONSIVE ART INSTALLATION.....	85
4.4 ANATOMICAL MODELLING TECHNIQUES	87
4.5 SURGICAL TRAINING SIMULATOR.....	88
4.6 BACKGROUND TO THE NEW WORKS	91
4.7 CONCLUSION	93
5 NEW WORKS.....	95
5.1 INTRODUCTION	95
5.2 CONCEPTUAL STRUCTURE & ITERATING TOWARDS EMERGENCE	97
5.2.A Summary.....	99
5.3 GLASS POND	99
5.3.A Installation	100
5.3.B Interaction experience.....	101
5.3.C Audio and visuals.....	102
5.3.D Technical details	104
5.4 GLASS POND TO EMERGENCE TO +-NOW	109

5.5 +-NOW	110
5.5.A Installation	110
5.5.B Interaction experience	112
5.5.C Visuals	113
5.5.D Technical details	117
5.6 NOVEL METHOD FOR CREATING EMERGENT SHAPES	122
5.7 CREATION OF THE ART SYSTEMS	123
5.7.A Reframing towards emergence	124
5.8 CONCLUSION	126
6 NEW STUDIES	128
6.1 INTRODUCTION	128
6.2 AIMS	128
6.3 STUDIES	129
6.3.A <i>Glass Pond</i> exploratory study	130
6.3.B +-now Exploratory study	132
6.3.C +-now Main study	132
6.3.D Summary of Studies	134
6.4 ANALYSIS	134
6.4.A Analysis of <i>Glass Pond</i> exploratory study	134
6.4.B Analysis of the +-now main study	139
6.4.C Coding schemes for +-now	141
6.5 CONCLUSION	145
7 STUDY FINDINGS	147
7.1 INTRODUCTION	147
7.2 REVIEW OF METHODS	148
7.3 GLASS POND EXPLORATORY STUDY	149
7.3.A Aims	149
7.3.B Findings	149
7.3.C Summary	155
7.4 EMERGENCE	155
7.5 EXPLORATORY STUDY OF +-NOW	157
7.5.A Aims	157
7.5.B Findings	157
7.5.C Summary	158
7.6 MAIN STUDY OF +-NOW	158
7.6.A Aims	158
7.6.B Findings	159
7.6.C Summary of main study	178
7.7 CONCLUSION	179

8 IMPLICATIONS FOR PRACTICE & DESIGN	181
8.1 INTRODUCTION	181
8.2 IMPLICATIONS FOR PRACTICE.....	181
8.2.A Finding emergence in <i>Glass Pond</i>	181
8.2.B Interaction duration.....	182
8.2.C Sand and experience	182
8.2.D Physical Installation.....	182
8.2.E Changes to my thinking and practice	183
8.2.F Abstraction	183
8.2.G Affordances of sand and emergence.....	184
8.3 IMPLICATIONS FOR DESIGN	184
8.3.A Openness in interaction.....	185
8.3.B Unpredictability and understanding.....	186
8.3.C Creativity in emergence	188
8.3.D Evaluation.....	188
8.4 SUMMARY.....	189
9 CONCLUSION.....	190
9.1 INTRODUCTION	190
9.2 AIMS AND OUTCOMES	190
9.3 SUMMARY OF THESIS OUTCOMES.....	191
9.3.A Glass Pond and +-now	191
9.3.B Novel method for emergent shapes.....	191
9.3.C Taxonomy of emergence in interactive art.....	192
9.3.D Study findings.....	193
9.3.E Implications of findings	193
9.4 FUTURE WORK	194
APPENDIX A DVD LEAFLET	201
APPENDIX B DESIGN ISSUES	203
APPENDIX C SAMPLE PROFILE I	208
APPENDIX D SAMPLE PROFILE II.....	215
APPENDIX E CONSENT FORMS	230
APPENDIX F PUBLICATIONS.....	234
REFERENCES.....	236

LIST OF FIGURES

FIGURE 1 RESEARCH AREAS UNDER INVESTIGATION.....	1
FIGURE 2 (GERO, 1996) SHOW HOW THE ORIGINAL SHAPE (A) WHEN REPRODUCED THREE TIMES AS IN (B), RENDERS MANY EMERGENT FORMS.	27
FIGURE 3 ORIGINAL SHAPE FROM (SOUFI AND EDMONDS, 1996).....	28
FIGURE 4 TRANSFORMATIVE SHAPES FROM THE ORIGINAL SHAPE IN FIGURE 3.....	28
FIGURE 5 SPIRAL MODEL OF THE SOFTWARE PROCESS FROM BOEHM (1986 p25).....	60
FIGURE 6 EXAMPLE OF A NETWORKED, TIME ORDERED DISPLAY FROM MILES AND HUBERMAN (BOX 5.2, 1994:114)	68
FIGURE 7 JEN SEEVINCK’S RESEARCH PROCESS AS DESCRIBED IN EDMONDS AND CANDY (2010).	69
FIGURE 8 THE PBR PROCESS OVER THE PERIOD OF CANDIDATURE. THIS IS AN EXPANSION OF THE VIEW GIVEN IN FIGURE 7.	70
FIGURE 9 THE PROCESS OF ITERATIVELY REFLECTING-IN-ACTION COMBINES METHODS FROM ITERATIVE DESIGN◆ REFLECTIVE PRACTICE ■ AND GROUNDED THEORY ▲.	73
FIGURE 10 FIGURE LOCATING RESEARCH MILESTONES ALONG THE SAME PROCESS OF ITERATIVE REFLECTION-IN-ACTION SHOWN IN FIGURE 9.....	74
FIGURE 11 <i>BELL, BOTTLE, FLOCK, TEXTURE, FOLD</i> COMPUTER GENERATED IMAGES FROM <i>BLUE IN THE BLUEBIRD</i> . PRINTS, J. SEEVINCK (C) 1999.	85
FIGURE 12 STICKY TRAFFIC, J.SEEVINCK 2003. IMAGES FROM THE INSTALLATION AND WORK AT A QUIET TIME (TOP) AND AS TRAFFIC INCREASED (BELOW).....	86
FIGURE 13 THIGH MODEL RECONSTRUCTED FROM IMAGE DATA.	88
FIGURE 14 WOUND DEBRIDEMENT SURGICAL SIMULATOR USING THE REACH IN DISPLAY AND PHANTOM HAPTIC DEVICE.	90
FIGURE 15 <i>I-PARK #2</i> J.SEEVINCK 2003. PHOTOMONTAGE. LANDSCAPE STUDY OF DIVERSITY OF NATURAL FOMS.	92
FIGURE 16 <i>INTERFACE</i> . J.SEEVINCK 2004. DRAWING. PRELIMINARY INTERFACE AND LANDSCAPE STUDY.	92
FIGURE 17 <i>STUDY</i> J.SEEVINCK 2003. PHOTOGRAPH. STUDY OF REFLECTED AND SUBSURFACE IMAGES IN THE LAKE.	93
FIGURE 18 <i>STUDY</i> J.SEEVINCK 2004. DRAWING OF PERCEPTUAL TENSION BETWEEN REFLECTIONS (CLOUDS) AND SUB-SURFACE OBJECTS (LEAVES ON THE BOTTOM OF THE LAKE).....	93
FIGURE 20 <i>GLASS POND</i> IMAGERY CONSTITUTES A ‘DAPPLED LIGHT’ BACKGROUND AND THE ‘GEO-FORMS’ FIGURE (LEFT)	100
FIGURE 21 INTERACTION WITH THE SAND IS ILLUMINATED BY ROOM LIGHTING AND SENSED USING THE VIDEO CAMERA.....	106
FIGURE 22 THE VIDEO IMAGE OF THE SAND (1) TO GENERATE 3 DIGITAL OBJECTS AND (2) COMBINING INTO A COMPOSITE SCREEN IMAGE (3).	106

FIGURE 23 DIAGRAM SHOWING THE SCENE GRAPH FOR THE <i>GLASS POND</i> ART SYSTEM SOFTWARE. THE SOFTWARE TAKES VIDEO IMAGE INPUT THROUGH A VIDEO TRANSFORMATION STAGE. THE VIDEO ACTS AS SENSOR INPUT TO AFFECT THE LIVE MAT AND GEOMETRICAL FORMS OBJECTS. IN CONTRAST THE THIRD BG OBJECT IS STATIC AND PASSIVE.	107
FIGURE 24 INSTALLATION VIEW OF +- NOW AT BETA_SPACE, MAY 2008.	111
FIGURE 25 PLAN AND PERSPECTIVE DIAGRAMS OF THE INSTALLATION OF +-NOW AT BETA_SPACE	112
FIGURE 26 DIAGRAM SHOWING HOW THE VIDEO IMAGE IS USED IN BOTH APPLICATIONS (A) AND (B). IN (A), THE VIDEO GENERATES THE COLOUR OBJECT WHICH IS COMPOSITED WITH A BACKGROUND OBJECT FOR DISPLAY ON THE SAND INTERFACE. IN (B), THE SAME VIDEO GENERATES THE MONOCHROME OBJECT WHICH IS COMPOSITED WITH A SECOND BACKGROUND OBJECT FOR DISPLAY ON THE WALL SCREEN.....	114
FIGURE 27 THE SPARKLE OF LIGHT ON WATER CURRENTS AT THE LAKE IN I-PARK. PHOTOGRAPH AND CLOSE-UP IMAGE. 2007 JEN SEEVINCK.	115
FIGURE 28 THE COLOUR IMAGE TRAILS CAN APPEAR TO 'WELL UP' OUT OF THE SAND, AND QUICKLY FOLLOWS GESTURES IN THE SAND. BRIGHT AREAS ALSO APPEAR THAT REFERENCE THE SPARKLE OF LIGHT ON THE WATER.	116
FIGURE 29 GESTURES IN THE SAND AND THE CORRESPONDING IMAGERY PROJECTED ON SCREEN IN THE ART SYSTEM '+-NOW'. A GESTURE IN THE SAND (1) CREATES A SHAPE (2). ANOTHER GESTURE (3) INTERSECTS WITH (1) TO CREATE BRIGHTER AREAS AND NEW SHAPES (4), (5). IN (5) AND (6) THE FIRST GESTURE FADES OUT WHILE THE SECOND FADES IN.	117
FIGURE 30 THE CAMERA VIEWS THE SAND SILHOUETTED AGAINST THE WHITE SAIL. THE SAND IS DIRECTLY LIT BY THE PROJECTOR. THE ROOM LIGHTING AND THE WALL PROJECTION ARE AMBIENT SOURCES OF LIGHT.	118
FIGURE 31 THE TWO +-NOW APPLICATIONS, ONE FOR THE COLOUR IMAGE AND THE OTHER FOR THE MONOCHROME IMAGE, SHARE THE SAME VIDEO INPUT AND HAVE SIMILAR SCENE GRAPHS. EACH APPLICATION COMPRISES TWO OBJECTS: ONE STATIC BACKGROUND OBJECT AND ONE DYNAMIC INTERACTIVE.....	119
FIGURE 32 DIGITAL PRIMARY COLOURS ADD TO CREATE WHITE.	121
FIGURE 33 A TRIANGULAR SHAPE EMERGES PERCEPTUALLY FROM THE INTERACTION (OVERLAP) OF 2 SQUARES.	123
FIGURE 34 THE STARTING CONDITION FOR THE EXPLORATORY STUDY OF <i>GLASS POND</i>	131
FIGURE 35 THE ANALYSIS STAGES USED IN THE EXPLORATORY STUDY OF <i>GLASS POND</i> (B, SHADED) AND FOR THE MAIN STUDY (C, ALL).	136
FIGURE 36 MAPPING SCHEME USED TO TEST COMPOSITE CODES FOR INSTANCES OF EMERGENCE CRITERIA CODES. A SOLID LINE MEANS THAT THE EMERGENCE CRITERIA CODE APPLIES WHILE A DOTTED LINE MEANS THIS IS ONLY A POSSIBILITY.	143
FIGURE 37 DEPICTS A TIME SERIES FROM THE INTERACTION SESSION OF PARTICIPANT 2: (A) BROAD STROKE WITH THE RIGHT FOREARM (7 MINS 33 SECS); (B) PAUSED AND LOOKING AT THE SCREEN (7 MINS 34 SECS); (C) EXTENDED PAUSE AND THE APPEARANCE OF THE GEO-FORM ACROSS THE DAPPLIED LIGHT	

IMAGE (7 MINS 37 SECS); (D) BROAD STROKE WITH THE LEFT FOREARM (7 MINS 40 SECS); (E) SAND TRAY MOVES ACROSS THE TABLE WITH THE PARTICIPANT’S STROKE (7 MINS 42 SECS).	152
FIGURE 38 HEARTBEAT , PHOTOGRAPH OF +- <i>NOW</i> INSTALLATION. J. SEEVINCK, 2008. A RECREATION OF THE ‘DYNAMIC COMPOSITION’ CREATED BY A PARTICIPANT DURING INTERACTION WITH +- <i>NOW</i>	158
FIGURE 39 NETWORK DISPLAY OF EMERGENT EXPERIENCES BY BACKGROUND IN DRAWING	172
FIGURE 40 PIE CHART DISPLAY OF PARTICIPANT EXPERIENCE OF EMERGENCE BY BACKGROUND IN DRAWING	172
FIGURE 41 NETWORK DISPLAY OF EMERGENT EXPERIENCES BY EXPERTISE.....	173
FIGURE 42 PIE CHART OF EMERGENT EXPERIENCE BY EXPERTISE.	173
FIGURE 43 NETWORK DISPLAY OF EMERGENT EXPERIENCES BY MARK-MAKING.....	174
FIGURE 44 PIE CHART OF EMERGENT EXPERIENCE BY MARK-MAKING.	174
FIGURE 45 NETWORK DISPLAY OF EMERGENT EXPERIENCES AND INTERACTION DURATION IN MINUTES. .	175
FIGURE 46 NETWORK DISPLAY OF INSTANCES OF DIFFERENT TYPES OF EMERGENCE	176
FIGURE 47 PIE GRAPH OF INSTANCES OF DIFFERENT TYPES OF EMERGENCE	176
FIGURE 48 RESEARCH AIMS AND CORRESPONDING OUTCOMES	190

LIST OF TABLES, EQUATIONS

TABLE 1 OVERVIEW OF AIMS, OUTCOMES, METHODS AND THE RELEVANT SECTIONS IN THE THESIS.	8
TABLE 2 TAXONOMY OF EMERGENCE IN INTERACTIVE ART.	22
TABLE 3 EVALUATION AIMS AND METHODS THAT ARE LIKELY TO SATISFY THEM AS SHOWN IN PREECE ET	
TABLE 4 THE CODES THAT CAME OUT OF THE ANALYSIS OF +- <i>NOW</i>	80
TABLE 5 EMERGENCE CRITERIA CODES THAT CAME OUT OF RESEARCH.	81
TABLE 6 ABBREVIATED LIST OF CODES THAT ARE FINALLY APPLIED.	81
TABLE 7 PARAMETER VALUES FOR COLOUR LIGHT OBJECT’S PHONG SHADER. THE VALUES USED HERE FALL OUTSIDE THE REAL WORLD VALUE RANGE, WHICH IS FROM 0 (NO LIGHT) TO 1 (MAXIMUM LIGHT). TRANSPARENCY ALSO VARIES FROM 0 (TRANSPARENT) TO 1 (OPAQUE).	121
TABLE 8 SUMMARY OF EMPIRICAL DATA COLLECTION METHODS USED FOR EACH OF THE THREE PARTICIPANT STUDIES. THIS TABLE DRAWS ON THE SUMMARY OF TECHNIQUES IN TABLE 1.	129
TABLE 9 INTERVIEW QUESTIONS USED FOR +- <i>NOW</i> MAIN STUDY.	133
TABLE 10 EXTRACT FROM A WITHIN-CASE DISPLAY OF <i>GLASS POND</i> STUDY DATA.	135
TABLE 11 COMPOSITE CODING SCHEME COMPRISING BOTH COGNITIVE STATE AND MOVEMENT CODES. THE MASTER AND SUB-CODES ARE LISTED FROM LEFT TO RIGHT, FOLLOWED BY SAMPLES OF PARTICIPANT BEHAVIOUR CODED THIS WAY.	137
TABLE 12 A LIST OF SOME OF THE PARTICIPANT BEHAVIOURS IDENTIFIED AS BEING OF INTEREST. THEY ARE FROM THE MAIN STUDY.	139
TABLE 13 TABLE 13 SIMILAR TOPICS WERE GROUPED TOGETHER AND THEN CODED. THESE TOPICS ARE ALSO SHOWN IN TABLE 12. THEY ORIGINATE FROM THE MAIN STUDY DATA.	140
TABLE 14 COMPOSITE CODING SCHEME INDUCED FROM DATA AND EXTERNAL LITERATURE. DEFINITIONS ARE TAKEN FROM OXFORD (2008).	142
TABLE 15 CODING SCHEME FOR EMERGENCE WAS GENERATED FROM EXTERNAL LITERATURE. DEFINITIONS ARE TAKEN FROM OXFORD (2008).	142
TABLE 16 CLASSIFICATION OF THE TYPE OF EMERGENCE RELIES ON TWO EMERGENCE CRITERIA CODES, FEEDBACK AND REF-CONC.	143
TABLE 17 OTHER NON-EMERGENT, INTERACTION BEHAVIOURS.	169
EQUATION 1.	109
EQUATION 2.	120

ABSTRACT

This thesis is concerned with creating and evaluating interactive art systems that facilitate emergent participant experiences. For the purposes of this research, interactive art is the computer based arts involving physical participation from the audience, while emergence is when a new form or concept appears that was not directly implied by the context from which it arose. This emergent ‘whole’ is more than a simple sum of its parts. The research aims to develop understanding of the nature of emergent experiences that might arise during participant interaction with interactive art systems. It also aims to understand the design issues surrounding the creation of these systems.

The approach used is Practice-based, integrating practice, evaluation and theoretical research. Practice used methods from Reflection-in-action and Iterative design to create two interactive art systems: *Glass Pond* and *+now*. Creation of *+now* resulted in a novel method for instantiating emergent shapes. Both artworks were also evaluated in exploratory studies. In addition, a main study with 30 participants was conducted on participant interaction with *+now*. These sessions were video recorded and participants were interviewed about their experience. Recordings were transcribed and analysed using Grounded theory methods. Emergent participant experiences were identified and classified using a taxonomy of emergence in interactive art. This taxonomy draws on theoretical research.

The outcomes of this Practice-based research are summarised as follows. Two interactive art systems, where the second work clearly facilitates emergent interaction, were created. Their creation involved the development of a novel method for instantiating emergent shapes and it informed aesthetic and design issues surrounding interactive art systems for emergence. A taxonomy of emergence in interactive art was also created. Other outcomes are the evaluation findings about participant experiences, including different types of emergence experienced and the coding schemes produced during data analysis.

